THEOLOGY

VOL. LXIV AUGUST, 1961 No. 494

Editorial

THE N.E.B. New Testament will obviously lead to a large output of books about it, in addition to the numerous articles that have already appeared. Lively interest has been aroused by the new translation among people upon whose minds other modern translations had apparently made no impact, and advantage should be taken of this interest while it is still fresh. The Faith Press is to be congratulated on being early in the field with a book by the Rev. C. S. Mann, *The New English New Testament: an Introduction* (10s. 6d.), which is good value for its modest price. Much of it supplies the kind of background information about translating the Bible which the intelligent layman needs. We presume this part of the book was written before the N.E.T. appeared. But there are two long chapters which survey the N.E.T. itself, and contain many detailed comments of interest. More than this, the author uses the occasion to convey a great deal of instruction about the literary character of the New Testament and about its theological themes. He mentions incidentally that the American committee, which was responsible for the R.S.V., was kept in being in order to take account of suggestions and criticisms. If we remember rightly, Mgr Knox published a provisional text of his translation so that he could take into account suggestions and criticisms before deciding on his definitive text. We do not know whether there are any similar plans in connexion with the N.E.T. When the translation of the Old Testament and Apocrypha is ready, there will be a good opportunity for incorporating some improvements of detail into the translation of the New Testament. There will by then no doubt be a large number of suggestions and criticisms that could be attended to with profit, e.g. Prof. Bruce's comment on 1 Cor. 5. 9 ("In my letter I wrote that you must have nothing to do with loose livers"): "Surely the collocation of 'loose livers' with floating kidneys in a number of oft-told tales should have put this expression out of court!"[1] It is indeed hard to understand how the translators passed such an expression. There are, however, other criticisms that may occur to readers which would be silenced if the insuperable difficulties of the translators' task were better appreciated. An important explanation of some of them was provided by Dr C. H. Dodd in an article on "Some Problems of New Testament Translation" in the June number of *The Expository Times.*

* * * * *

Autres temps autres mœurs.—"I was glad to find that the famous story of the New Zealand chief, who being informed that he could not be received as a Christian while he had two wives, got out of the

[1] *Scottish Journal of Theology,* p. 196.

difficulty by eating one of them, was no fiction. Bishop Selwyn told Sir George Bowen that it was he to whom the promising convert applied, stating what he had done."—Diary of Sir Mountstuart E. Grant Duff, 19 December 1891.

* * * * *

The editor will be in the U.S.A. and Canada from 8 August to 22 September and will be unable to attend to correspondence during that period. The September and October numbers of THEOLOGY will appear as usual.

Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation

IT has been suggested by a number of writers in recent years—and by myself as strongly as by anyone—that a great deal of the conflict between Catholic and Protestant theologians in the 16th century and after has been due to their common inheritance from late medieval theology of false or unbalanced assumptions which have made fruitful discussion extremely difficult and agreement impossible. As I said in the Foreword to my book *The Recovery of Unity,* it is hardly to be expected that *every* point of theological contention will yield to the method of seeking unconscious theological presuppositions,[1] but it has seemed to offer a hopeful line of investigation on the burning question, among others, of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The suggestion was that a simple identification of sacrifice with death led to the relation between the Eucharist and Calvary being regarded by Catholics as one of *repetition* and by Protestants as one of *commemoration,* and the very remarkable rapprochement between many Catholic and Protestant writers at the present day on the subject could be plausibly explained as being largely due to the common recovery of a more comprehensive and balanced understanding of sacrifice.[2]

Clearly the confirmation of this suggestion demands a thorough examination of the writings of theologians of both the late-medieval and the Reformation period. This has been undertaken by a number of writers, including the late B. J. Kidd[3] and Dr C. W. Dugmore[4] with, apparently, a positive result. Now, however, it has been done over again at very great length by Fr Francis Clark, and the results of his researches are presented in the impressive volume which is now in our hands.[5] He has deliberately limited himself to this particular key-doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice and has referred to other

[1] Op. cit., p. xi.

[2] Cf. my article "The Eucharistic Sacrifice" in *C.Q.R.*, April–June and July–September 1961.

[3] *The Later Medieval Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice,* 1898.

[4] *The Mass and the English Reformers,* 1958.

[5] *Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation.* By Francis Clark, S.J. Pp. x+582. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press. London: Darton, Longman and Todd. 1960. 50s.

doctrines only incidentally. Thus, for example, Fr C. G. Tavard's application of the hypothesis of late-medieval decay to the problem of the relation between Scripture and Tradition[1] falls outside his scope. Fr Clark's conclusion can be stated quite simply. He has investigated systematically no less than eleven alleged defects in late-medieval theology which bear upon the Eucharistic Sacrifice and which have been alleged to explain the attitude of the Reformers, and his examination of the relevant writings has led him to conclude that in every case the alleged defect was to all intents and purposes non-existent; it was foisted upon the Catholics by the Reformers, who, with their basically anti-incarnational views of grace and justification, had convinced themselves that these were the sort of things that, in spite of their remonstrances and denials, Catholics must have really believed. Late-medieval Eucharistic theology turns out to be, if anything, rather old-fashioned and unadventurous, and in particular the famous equation "sacrifice = death" turns out to be a chimera. So far as it was ever accepted by Catholics, it was by a few in the Counter-Reformation and later, and even then it was in a comparatively harmless form.

Now clearly, the passing of a definitive judgment on Fr Clark's conclusions would require as lengthy and detailed an examination of all his sources as he has himself made; it is much to be hoped that this will be undertaken. It may be said at once that there is no reason whatever to suspect Fr Clark of carelessness or incompetence, and he has evidently tried to be scrupulously fair. The method which he has followed, however, makes it very difficult to judge whether he has in fact succeeded in giving a balanced account of late-medieval thought on the Eucharist. To assemble quotations in groups in order to rebut eleven distinct criticisms is a procedure of polemical rather than expository value; and, as I shall show later on, in at least one case the texts which are adduced in order to refute one charge provide fairly strong evidence in favour of another. However, granting the substantial accuracy of Fr Clark's material, there are three questions which may be usefully asked.

First, had the medievals a satisfactory doctrine of sacrifice as such? However much the point may have been exaggerated later on, as by the writers of the 17th-century French school, the note of destruction was present in St Thomas's amplifications of the assertion that there is a sacrifice when "something is done with things offered to God" by the illustrations "as when animals are killed and burnt, or when bread is broken, eaten and blessed".[2] There was, to say the least, only a very dim realization of the truth to which in our own day Canon Eugène Masure has given such eloquent and inspiring expression,[3] that the essence of sacrifice is the offering of God's creature to God, not to be destroyed but to be transformed by his acceptance of it, and that the element of death is strictly relative to the world's actual fallen condition.

[1] *Holy Writ or Holy Church*, 1959.
[2] *S. Theol.*, II II, lxxxv, 3 ad 3.
[3] Cf. *The Christian Sacrifice* and *The Sacrifice of the Mystical Body*.

Secondly, had the medievals a satisfactory doctrine of the sacrifice of Christ? Again, I think no. Fr Clark does indeed quote one glorious passage from Denys the Carthusian: "All that he said, did and endured he did and suffered for our salvation unto the glory of the Father; all that he did and suffered was meritorious for our sake. Thus the whole life of Christ on earth was, as it were, one solemn Mass, in which he himself was the altar and the temple, the priest and the victim."[1] No doubt this passage could be paralleled by others. Nevertheless the general tendency is not merely to see the Cross as central to Christ's sacrifice but as identical with it. (Every one of the thirteen passages which Fr Clark quotes on pp. 391–3 in order to show that the Catholics did not assert a *literal* immolation of Christ in the Mass makes this identification; on p. 228 he himself admits that this was true of popular medieval devotion. And in his citation of popular devotional passages on p. 288 he quite groundlessly takes the medieval habit of meditating on different events of Christ's life at different moments of the Mass as indicating a theological understanding of the inclusive nature of Christ's sacrifice.) In consequence, the question of the relation of the Eucharist to Christ's sacrifice becomes simply the question of the relation of the Eucharist to Calvary. And, in spite of his drastic criticisms of F. N. Hicks, Fr Clark has to admit that Hicks was perfectly clear that this particular emphasis was exaggerated rather than repudiated by the Reformers.

So then, thirdly, had the medievals a satisfactory doctrine of the relation of the Eucharist to the sacrifice of Christ? Fr Clark assembles a great many passages to prove that they did not explicitly teach that Calvary is *repeated* in the Mass. Indeed he argues that their dominant thought was one of *commemoration* rather than *repetition*. In this case, we should have a case of the Reformers uncritically (as I should say) inheriting an inadequate assumption from the late medievals rather than reacting against them, and we may well here have an illustration of the thesis which Dr T. M. Parker has argued in his eagerly awaited Birkbeck Lectures, that most of the issues and concepts which we think of as characteristic of the 16th century had already been discussed in the 14th century or even earlier. My suggestion that, because of their identification of sacrifice with death, Catholics thought of the Mass in terms of repetition of Calvary, and Protestants in terms of commemoration, seems to need revision; rather it would appear that both Catholics and Protestants thought in terms of commemoration, though Protestants could not persuade themselves that Catholics did so. However, I have been at pains to point out[2] that when Catholics thought in terms of repetition, it was hardly ever *literal* repetition. In fact the word "repetition" itself needs clarification. When we speak of "repeating a performance" we do not normally mean that anything is done to the performance, as when, for example, we speak of "interrupting a per-

[1] Quoted on p. 527.
[2] *Corpus Christi*, p. 83; *The Recovery of Unity*, p. 4.

formance" or "applauding a performance"; we do not mean that the original performance is witnessed again (though, paradoxically, as I shall argue below, if we did mean this, *in a carefully defined sense*, we should have found the key to the deadlock in Eucharistic doctrine). We mean that a new appearance is enacted which, in its appearance and circumstances, closely resembles the original one. And in Chapter V and elsewhere in his book Fr Clark seems to show that this was the medieval and Tridentine view: Christ was offered with shedding of blood on Calvary; he is offered in an unbloody way in the Mass. That is to say, although the Victim is the same, there are two different offerings, whether the second offering is better described as a "repetition" or as a "commemoration". In Chapter XII, on the other hand, we are told that the late-medieval (and Catholic) doctrine is that the sacrifice of the altar is simply *identical* with the sacrifice of the Cross;[1] St John Fisher said so, and so, more significantly, did Pope Leo XIII. So too did Jeremy Taylor and the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in 1897. Now Fr Clark very reasonably remarks that "these two propositions cannot be simultaneously true: that the reformers repudiated the Mass because the prevailing Catholic view had made it a realistic immolation, a repetition of the slaying of Christ on Calvary; and that they repudiated the Mass because the prevailing Catholic view had taught them to see it as a mere commemoration of Calvary".[2] What Fr Clark fails to see is that he has in two different places argued that the late medievals held (and rightly held) both these points of view, however irreconcilable they may seem to be. In effect, they first of all asserted the absolute identity of the sacrifice of the altar with the sacrifice of the Cross and then, when they realized that this would seem to imply an actual slaying of Christ in the Mass (as seems, for all Fr Clark's attempts to explain them otherwise, to be the plain implication of the visions of bleeding hosts), they substituted for identity the notion of commemoration. We have, I think, here an example of the fact, which has many examples in the history of Christian doctrine, that views which are unbalanced or unstable have a disconcerting way of toppling over into their opposites.

The missing factor, which as I have suggested above provides the key to the deadlock, is provided by the notion of *sacramental signification*, according to which the Eucharist, in virtue of its divine institution, neither commemorates nor repeats the sacrifice of Christ's earthly life but makes it *sacramentally present*.[3] On this view it is possible to hold that the Mass is the *same* sacrifice (not *as Calvary*, for that would unduly limit the sacrifice to the Cross, but) as the whole offering of Christ's earthly life, from the incarnation through the culmination on Calvary to the unending heavenly glory, without any new immolation taking place. And, with this inclusive understanding of the sacrifice, it is easy to give its proper Eucharistic reference to the fact of the heavenly offering without any danger of eviscerating the Cross of Christ. The wider view of sacrifice and

[1] Cf. p. 247. [2] P. 328. [3] Cf. my *Corpus Christi*, pp. 94 f.

the notion of sacramental signification together seem to me to provide the approach which can give to Eucharistic theology the stability which neither the medievals nor the Reformers could give it and to rescue it from the dilemma of repetition or commemoration. But, as Fr Clark recognizes, the emphasis upon sacramental signification is comparatively modern. Only in recent years, in such writers as Masure and Journet, do we get a clear realization that the Mass is not a different *offering* of the same *Victim* but a different *re-presentation* of the same *offering*, a re-presentation by the unique mode of sacramental signification. In spite of his narrow limitation of the Sacrifice to Calvary, it is the great merit of Mgr Journet's work *La Messe: Presence du sacrifice de la croix* that it insists that in the Mass not only the one Victim but the one Sacrifice must be present, difficult as he finds it to account, in terms of the strict Aristotelianism to which he adheres, for the repeated presence not merely of the same *object* but of the same *act*. I think his difficulty would have been less if he had envisaged the sacrificial act of Christ as extending through his whole incarnate life and as now persisting in his ascended glory.

What, then, of the Reformers? In Fr Clark's view, they were neither reacting against late-medieval corruptions nor inheriting them; they were simply holding a false theological position against a true one. And this holds for Cranmer no less than for Luther and Calvin. Fr Clark gives a full and useful account of the controversy about Cranmer's view of the Eucharistic presence (or absence) which was stirred to life by Dom Gregory Dix fifteen years ago. He clearly agrees with Dix on the broad issue, and he sees his recent investigations as confirming the view about the alleged defect of intention in Anglican consecrations and ordinations which he stated in 1956 in his book *Anglican Orders and Defect of Intention*. I discussed that book at length in the *Church Quarterly Review* of January–March 1957, and I do not think that anything in his new book affects the argument which I there set forth. Nor in my view does it affect what I said in the chapter which I was courteously allowed to contribute to Fr A. A. Stephenson's book *Anglican Orders;* in any case, Fr Stephenson has made it plain that he is no longer prepared to argue against the validity of Anglican orders on the grounds there expressed and he has withdrawn his book from circulation.[1] Neither the personal views of the compilers of the Anglican ordinal nor those of the bishops who were prepared to use it seem to me to be of any weight against the plainly expressed intention to continue the threefold ministry which had always existed in the Church.

Finally, what about nominalism? Fr Clark considers that this has been made into far too much of a bogey, that nominalism was only one of a number of schools of late-medieval thought and that theologians who were nominalist in their philosophy were more likely to hold on to theological orthodoxy by denying that there was any connexion between faith and reason than to contaminate their theo-

[1] Cf. his article in *The Old Palace*, No. 22, p. 31 (1961).

logy with nominalist elements. This too is a matter that has been illuminated by Dr Parker in his Birkbeck Lectures, and it is clearly more intricate than has often been thought. I, for one, should certainly not suggest that nominalist theologians were less orthodox theologically than those of other schools. What I would suggest is that, in spite of his disrespectful attitude to philosophy as such, Luther shared with the Catholic nominalists a philosophical outlook which, paradoxically, was more congenial to his theology than to theirs. It may well be that both tendencies operated together and that, for example, it was the inability of nominalism to provide adequate forms of thought that led Luther both to denounce reason in matters of faith and at the same time to sympathize with Occamism as the only type of philosophy which was congenial to his own views about faith and grace. In Fr Clark's words, "in the development of Protestantism it is not fanciful to see a new and radical application of Ockham's minimalism in metaphysics and of his voluntarism in theodicy".[1]

One of the most useful features of Fr Clark's book is provided by the quotations which he has gathered from Catholic divines of both the late-medieval and the Reformation period; one is sometimes left wondering why the thoughts which they express have been so much neglected since. There is a splendid passage from Schatzgeyer about the sacrifice of the Whole Christ:

> The sacrifice of Christ to God the Father belongs not to Christ himself alone but also to the Church, which is his mystical body, and to every member of that body—that is, to every believing Christian. . . . It is one who offers the sacrifice: Christ the head and his body the Church together with the members.

In this and similar passages, from Pighius and Latomus, we see the middle ages at their best and we are reminded of the magnificent exposition of the three births of Christ—in eternity, at Bethlehem and in the Church—given by Isaac of Stella four centuries before and rescued for us by Père Bouyer in his book *The Cistercian Heritage*.[2] And the quotations from popular sermons and manuals of devotion, like the anthologies of R. H. Benson and Miss Frances Comper,[3] bear witness to a deep and simple devotion to the incarnate Lord which, unbalanced as it no doubt was from the standpoint of strict theology, is deeply moving as the medium in which so many of our forefathers adored their Redeemer and found their way to heaven.

To conclude what, on grounds of space if on no other, can be only a very inadequate account of a book of over two hundred thousand words, Fr Clark has made an intimidatingly thorough contribution towards the urgent task of finding out just what was the nature of the theological situation out of which the Reformation developed. In doing this he has shown that, at least on the one particular issue of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, an interpretation that had seemed to

[1] P. 307.
[2] Pp. 178 f.
[3] *A Book of the Love of Jesus*, 1918; *Spiritual Songs*, 1936.

offer a valuable clue needs reconsideration. It is not so clear what clue he has to put in its place. In any case, his further conclusion, that another nail has been driven into the coffin of the Catholic position in Anglicanism does not seem to me to follow. If Fr Clark thinks that Anglicans are committed to defending the theological orthodoxy of the Reformers or to making excuses for their errors it should be sufficient to refer again to Gregory Dix's discussion of Cranmer.[1] What I find disappointing is that such a massive and laborious work as Fr Clark's leaves us farther than ever from understanding how the later-medieval theology was followed by that of the Reformers except as a result of sheer diabolical malice. Nevertheless, the striking rapprochement between Catholic and Protestant theologians on the question of the Eucharistic Sacrifice remains a fact of the utmost significance at which Fr Clark rejoices with the rest of us, while we shall do well to heed his warning that it does not go as far as some people have thought.

E. L. Mascall.

Christ and Borstal

This article is an attempt to describe and evaluate a current effort at evangelism in Borstal. During the past four summers, groups of undergraduates from five Oxford colleges have been camping with boys from several Borstals, and then returning to spend some time in the Borstals themselves. In what follows, I shall have principally in mind the camps between my own college, Pembroke, and Pollington Borstal, near Goole in Yorkshire, but it must be emphasized that these are only part of a larger scheme.

The scheme was devised with the aim of bringing the knowledge of Christ and his church to boys who have normally had little experience of organized religion. It is not easy to describe in a short space the boys whom we have been meeting during the past four years, nor is it pleasant to make the attempt, for none of us likes to anatomize his friends in a few short sentences. A great deal of the truth about Borstal boys, as we have known them, is that they are delightful and friendly people, with all the vigour and pleasure in companionship characteristic of young men of their age. Their relative freedom from the conventions of society is a particularly attractive feature. One hears little cant or hypocrisy from them, and they have a willingness to question accepted platitudes which is invigorating, and at times disconcerting. It is common to find that an undergraduate, on his first meeting with them, will express amazement that such pleasant people could have committed serious, and sometimes brutal, crimes. It is not long, however, before one discovers features which distinguish the Borstal *ethos* from the attitudes of young people in normal society. One of these is a failure of deter-

[2] *The Shape of the Liturgy*, ch. xvi. Cf. also *C.Q.R.*, 1947–8, for the subsequent controversy with G. B. Timms.

mination, an aimlessness which brings many boys drifting back to crime after they have determined to give it up. There is an inability to persist in what they intend to do, or even to calculate properly their own advantage; it is surprising how many of them arrive in Borstal for crimes which, on any rational reckoning, are almost without purpose. The Borstal boy admires the "shrewd" man, the man who gets to the front of the queue. On the whole, he fails miserably in his pursuit of this ideal of shrewdness. Allied to this lack of determined purpose is a resentment against authority. With some boys, this is a deep and bitter hatred which one discerns only when one comes to know them well. With others, it is a simple reflection of the mood of the group. Whatever form it takes, however, this hostility to accepted authority is common to almost all. Strikingly enough, the boys whom we have met have shown little hostility to the Borstal authorities themselves. The Borstal provides for them a protected environment within which a boy can make necessary adjustments in his attitude. His resentment tends to be fixed, not on those who look after him in Borstal, but on those who sent him there. His chief target for resentment will almost certainly be the police; but he is liable to be hostile to all the organs and symbols of established society: the magistrate, the probation officer, the public schools, the universities, the rich, the royal family, all come, in their different ways, under his violent criticism. The Borstal boy's lack of determination, and his hostility to the accepted order, have a good deal of connexion with each other. Most of the boys have passed beyond the point where the normal moral sanctions of society can stir them to moral effort or to reform. The accepted morality of society lacks any power to challenge them. The condemnation of most of their fellow-men no longer holds any threat to them; for most of them have lived a great part of their lives under that condemnation, and (rightly or wrongly) they have come to believe that society, marked as it is by hypocrisy and unfairness, has no moral right to condemn them.

The prevailing attitude to the church must be understood against this background. A quarter or more of the boys are Roman Catholics, and this group has an outlook of its own which cannot be considered here. Of the rest, it can be said generally that they have had very little contact with any Christian denomination. Up to the time of their arriving at Borstal, very few have had any serious experience of the work of the Church. As a result of the work of chaplains in the Borstal service, a substantial number (although decidedly a minority) finds a place in the life and worship of the Church. With these exceptions, however, it is still true that the majority of Borstal boys knows next to nothing about the Christian faith. Their only recent contact, over the previous few years, with worship will probably be the weekly statutory service at the Borstal, and we have found that this service is very unpopular with all the boys, although additional voluntary services often draw quite substantial congregations. Most boys, given this basic ignorance, are inclined to regard the Church as part of the Establishment which they hate so much.

They think it ineffective and fatuous rather than actively vicious; but most of them think of the Church as "them" rather than "us", as part of the set-up operated by the privileged and self-satisfied. This whole outlook upon life and upon the Church, of course, is not confined to Borstal boys; in approaching a Borstal community one finds, in a sharpened form, the doubts and suspicions which are common enough among their contemporaries in wide areas of English society.

When, in 1957, a team of Christian undergraduates from Pembroke was invited to go for a fortnight to camp with a group of Borstal boys at Spennithorne in Wensleydale, certain basic assumptions about our approach to them were made at once. It was plain that no advance was possible along the lines of the old-fashioned mission. "Being preached at" is an experience which most of the boys regard with horror, for, although they have heard few sermons from the pulpit, they have, most of them, heard several from the magistrate's bench. It was equally plain that, in a few days, one could not hope to communicate much about the Gospel to those who would probably be little disposed to hear. If we hoped for quick conversions, we were bound to find either none at all, or very superficial ones. These practical considerations confirmed our determination, reached on theological grounds, to work along quite different lines.

The pre-suppositions of our approach in these camps have been two. The first is that the one thing which we can usefully offer is the experience of love in the Church. At the human level, this means approaching the boys with friendship, and attempting to be their true equals in all the activities of the camp. At a more profound level, it means attempting to express the love of God in our life together. The aim has been that the camps should be manned by undergraduates from the Christian fellowship of each college, who are already living and growing together in Christ. The boys from Pollington can thus be invited into a community which already exists, and which has been welded together in prayer, witness and life, rather than into a formless situation in which something has to be erected from the beginning. Our aim has simply been to live with our Pollington friends as Christians. What emerges from that experience is a matter for the boys who come, and ultimately for the Holy Spirit. To this a second assumption is joined. The purpose of our work is "salvation" or "wholeness". This includes, as a proper part of our aims, the restoration of a boy to a right relationship with society. What we hope for is that our friendship (such as it is) will be answered by friendship, our love (such as it is) be answered by love. It is a great deal if we can help a boy to respond generously to approaches made by other people, and to be tolerant in face of stupidity or unfairness in others. It is true, indeed, that this is not the whole thing. The ultimate end is that a boy should see the love of God reflected in the life of the Christian community, and respond to that love by the acceptance of Christ as his Lord. This perfect response is always being hampered by sin, which alike obscures the

Pembroke witness and deadens the Pollington response; but any partial answer, any breaking in of love where there was no love before, is a true victory of the Holy Spirit. Not that we come to the camps as mere givers of "wholeness"; we are seeking to be made whole ourselves also. One simple illustration of the way in which our own life as a fellowship is enriched is the possibility of active co-operation opened by the camps among all denominations. It would, I think, be agreed by all—Anglican, Roman Catholic and Nonconformist—that a deep and happy fellowship has been possible in the common work, yet without any evasion of issues or disloyalty to the rules of our Churches.

These are the suppositions upon which the detailed life of the camps has been constructed. The general time-table is much what one expects to find in any camp: a day's work, a whole day's outing by bus, a series of hikes, culminating in a two-day hike in parties of four, who sleep the night in barns or wherever they can. There are about forty campers in each camp, made up equally of undergraduates and Pollington boys, and the basic unit in planning is the group of four, two Pembroke and two Pollington. This group is the unit for camp duties and for the two-day hike, and each tent contains two of these groups. Although, in many of the activities of the camp, there is no overwhelming reason why campers should stay in their particular four, it usually happens that the closest ties of friendship are built up within this group, and its members tend to remain together in most of the things they do. By the end of the camp, it is often far from easy to determine the provenance of the various campers, for the whole community is talking a common *patois* consisting of Borstal slang with an Oxford accent, and all alike are covered by an obscuring layer of Wensleydale mud. During the past two years, we have followed a week's camping with a visit by all the undergraduates to Pollington for a few days, in an attempt to avoid too drastic a break in the relations between all the campers and to give the whole of the institution a share in the experience. The undergraduates live, in all its strenuous details, the life of the Pollington boys. This total sharing is the real aim of our planning and, we believe, is the effective agent of our evangelism. It also makes it possible clearly to envisage our whole life together at camp and in the Borstal as a true offering of our bodies as our reasonable worship to God. We have always been at pains not to thrust the services of the Church at boys who are not ready for them. The boys are asked to be present at camp prayers each evening; these last, literally, for a minute and are taken jointly by Pembroke and Pollington campers. They are asked also to come to the service in the parish church on Sunday morning, when during the camps there is a conducted Eucharist. On weekdays, mattins and evensong are said, and there is a daily celebration, in the church adjoining the camp site; but these are envisaged, not as agencies for evangelism (for the daily offices are remarkably unsuitable for this purpose), but as the daily and voluntary offering to God of the life of the whole camp. The Pollington boys are very welcome to attend; but they are not obliged, or

even encouraged, to do so. There is one further element of the camp which requires mention. The welcome which the people of Spennithorne, and of Wensleydale generally, have offered to the camp is indispensable to its working, for one could scarcely deposit considerable groups of Borstal boys about the countryside without the agreement of those who live there. The contribution of the local people, however, has gone further than that; they have had an important part in the healing work done at the camps. Many of the boys have been deeply impressed by the kindness which they have met at the hands of ordinary people throughout the Dale, and the camp can best be envisaged as the meeting-place of three communities—Pembroke, Pollington and Spennithorne—to the enrichment of all three.

What, finally, of the effect of the camps? They have now been running for four years, and it is possible to make some sort of assessment. The first thing to be said is that there has been a remarkable willingness on the part of the Pollington boys to meet the undergraduates at a deep personal level. It is not only from our side that the barrier between different cultures has been overcome; the Borstal boys have done quite as much as we have to overthrow it, and they have been delightful friends and companions and, during our stay at Pollington, attentive and generous hosts. At the least, then, there has been a meeting, of an exciting and informative kind, between groups of people one might think beyond each other's reach. One may hope that permanent good may have been done to some boys at least by the discovery that there are people in society, and especially in the Church, who care actively about them, and that it is possible to get across the barrier into close personal touch with such people. More can, however, be said than this. For some boys, the camp has provided a real opportunity for a new evaluation of their life. A good deal of fundamental re-thinking of problems and attitudes has gone on at these camps, and in some cases a boy has won through to a new appreciation of the possibilities of life, sometimes as a Christian, sometimes simply as a responsible citizen. To this may be added that several boys have become members of the Church through the medium of these camps. Four boys were confirmed in 1959 as a result of the Pembroke camp alone, and those of whom I have recent information have continued loyal in their discipleship. It would, however, be wrong to suppose that only the campers from Pollington have been affected by their experience. It is probable that, overall, the effect upon the Oxford party has been quite as great. For us, the camps have been a great time of testing: one is liable to find, in a moment of stress, that one cares much more, or much less, about Christ and his people than one had previously thought. The interesting thing, however, is that the process of testing is directed less against the Pembroke men as individuals than against the quality of our common life. It is our fellowship in the Holy Spirit, as it has been established during the previous year's life together, which has to bear the weight of the camp; and, if it stands firm, we have found that our understanding of each other and of our Lord is greatly deepened.

I would prefer, however, to give the last word to one of the Pollington boys, and will end with an extract from a report written by one of them after the 1959 camp. It is quoted exactly as he wrote it, and may stand as a very shrewd judgment of this particular approach, in its strength and its limitations.

"I think that the camp is wonderful and profitable thing to all boys who go, only if they realize and understand what it could mean to them. This can be put under A, B and C.

A. Some boys go and have fun and try to get the most pleasure out of it they can, taking no notice of others, just being selfish. They have a certain amount of fun, but they achieve nothing from it.

B. Others are slightly more serious, they have a good time but also take an interest, the beauty of being free and also what the future may hold for them. The camp making it possible. The achievement being able to speak freely to anyone with no thought of not being wanted.

C. The very serious person looked upon the camp as something special. At his first sight of the camp he knew by instinct that this is maybe his only chance to start his life afresh so that best to help himself, taking every one else into consideration, is by setting out properly on the right foot. He meets the students warmly and at once feels confident in himself. As he gets to know them better he finds that they are linked together by religion. He may wonder about this and is amazed to find that these undergraduates are willing to do anything for each other whatever it is. He thinks about these points and many others until he knows what is wanted of him in his life. To live rightly and to enjoy life as it is maybe with God or just settling down with a family. He achieves the knowledge of the right and better way to live which includes everything."

COLIN MORRIS.

Revised Reviews: VIII — Brunner's The Divine Imperative

THE preface to a book is that part of it which should be read first. There is the temptation to ignore a preface because so often an author will use it merely to acknowledge help given to him or to mention matters only indirectly connected with the text. In the case of *The Divine Imperative,* which was admirably translated into English, it is essential for the understanding of the book that the preface be read first, because it is here that Brunner states the purpose he has in mind, the foundation upon which he will build and the line which his argument will take.

His purpose is to provide a comprehensive book on Ethics, which makes the Protestant Evangelical Faith its centre. (There are 567 pages of text and a further 150 pages of excellent notes.) The reader, who may not entirely agree with his premises or who may later dissent from some of his conclusions, would be ill-advised to take

the author's advice in the preface when he discusses the phrase "a demand for Ethics" and especially the demand for doctrinal authority in Ethics. He writes, "I have called my book a 'Protestant Ethic' in order that those who desire to hear *that* answer to the 'Demand for Ethics' may be saved the trouble of reading it." To do as he suggests would be to miss reading a book which is full of interest, has much to say that ought to be said, and presents its ideas in a thought-provoking way.

Brunner first of all makes a rapid survey of the various influences which lie behind human conduct and examines the different ethical systems which have been evolved by taking one or other of these influences as the directing factor behind conduct. The conclusion is reached that Reason is incapable of producing the ultimate Ethic. It has produced so many mutually exclusive systems that it is impossible to find some basis which they share in common. He feels, therefore, that it is necessary to make a selection amongst these various systems and chooses that of Kant as the most hopeful for his purpose. The Kantian Ethic is based on the human "goodwill". Brunner accepts the idea of "will" as the basis of Ethics, but rejects the idea that "goodwill" can be human. The universal presence of sin—"For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God"—precludes the idea that perfect goodness can be the product of human will. Furthermore, it is the Bible message that God alone is good, and so the only perfectly "goodwill" is God's will. So instead of the Kantian Categorical Imperative he postulates the Divine Imperative. God's will is his Kingdom in which the controlling motive is love and there is no service of God which is not also service towards man. This sense of community is later developed in the third section of the book, which deals with the practical expression of the Christian Ethic. The contrast between what is, and what ought to be, is occasioned by sin. Since man is a sinner he cannot create goodness. Goodness is solely God's creation and is therefore in the nature of a gift placed within man by God. The perfection of goodness consists in complete identification with God's purpose in love, which, as Brunner himself states, is "the end of all ethics".

Having reached this point he has to face the problem which his own argument has created and which he expresses thus, "Does this Christian person, who owes no one anything save love, and who still owes this love really exist?" He finds such existence to be possible, in Faith, conceived as something which happens through the action of God, and which comes into being only through obedience to God. The good consists in doing God's will at the particular moment. The Christian Ethic is not based on any universal principle. It can only offer guidance in making a decision, but cannot order what that decision should be. It must be individual and for that precise moment and occasion. The possible tendency towards antinomianism, inherent in such a view, he seeks to offset by recalling that the Christian is guided both by the Scriptures and by the Spirit. He appears to have a particular horror of legalism and literalism, and in his reaction against these comes near at times to the antinomian-

ism which he fears. This attitude later raises certain problems and difficulties.

Then he turns to the explanation of the Divine will as that which makes our conduct good. In a series of sixteen propositions he seeks to make clear the content of what he calls the Divine Imperative. This section is introduced with the statement that it does not contain an argument which is developed from chapter to chapter. Instead, each of the sixteen propositions is like one of the spokes of a wheel, and each leads to the centre, which is the Divine Command. This method of starting from the beginning each time, but from a slightly different angle, keeps the Divine Command continuously to the forefront of one's thoughts, though it does lead to a certain amount of reiteration. The Divine Command is examined from three aspects—from the Divine Will as the norm of the good, from "the New Man in Christ", and from what is termed "Works of Love".

From the discussion of these, we see emerging, not an interim ethic, but what is in effect a dual ethic. The ultimate Christian Ethic is in Love and must be personally active in an "I—Thou" relationship to God and our fellow-man. Moreover, it is seen to be God's will that man should live on earth in certain Orders of community. The Orders, though human, are in a sense divine, because it is willed by God that the Christian must live in and through them. The Christian Ethic is to love, but since the individual is a sinner, the person with whom he is brought in contact in community is a sinner, and the environment in which he works is vitiated by sin, then it is only in moments of personal contact that he is able to act according to the Christian Ethic. As, however, God wills that he must act in this environment, then his actions must be adapted to the circumstances and situation in which he finds himself. The setting up of the ultimate, i.e. Love in perfection, as the norm of the Christian Ethic, requires the creation of an ethic on a lower level which can act as a guide to conduct in the ordinary circumstances of life. Thus to act within the Orders, as God wills that he must do, the Christian must be content to act according to a lower ethical standard, apart from those moments when he can give expression to the ultimate in personal relationship.

It is naturally in the practical working out of the Christian Ethic, in the third and largest section of the book, that the inherent difficulties of such an approach to Ethics become most apparent. According to the conclusions reached in the earlier sections, no connected and comprehensive system for Christian conduct can, or indeed ought to, be evolved. The individual only knows what he should do at the actual moment at which God calls him to action. What he does at that particular moment does not determine what he should do in exactly similar circumstances at another moment, nor is his action comparable to that of another person in the same circumstances. This would be to make a certain mode of conduct a universal law and so fall into the trap of legalism.

The Christian cannot be subject to law. Still less can God. All

would agree that God can be bound neither by his own laws nor by a controlling force beyond himself to which he is compelled to submit. But, are law and order, as it were, to be set against God? May they not be part of God himself? Brunner almost admits this in one of his propositions (p. 122) when he says, "But since the will of God which demands obedience is the same as His will which gives, He cannot command anything but the obedient imitation of His activity as Creator and Redeemer." The words "He cannot" can only mean that there is some controlling force limiting God, or that law, in this case negative law, is part of God himself, and being part of God is therefore universal. To assert that God has set part of himself, i.e. his Divine Law, in the world for universal acceptance, would not be to limit God in any way, for it would be part of God and of his universal love, immanent in the world.

The difficulty which comes through this desire to set aside any law of universal application, from the idea that all law is tainted by human sin, is most clearly seen in the section on Marriage and Divorce. Reference is made to our Lord's teaching on these subjects in St Matthew 19. In these verses, our Lord makes definite and precise statements of universal application, yet Brunner says, "How are we to understand it without falling into biblical literalism?" But is there any valid reason why we should not accept our Lord's recorded words literally? This, however, is an important chapter and there is much justification for his plea that further study and a new approach to the whole subject of the relation of the sexes is required.

It is in the spheres of Labour and Economics, and principally in relation to the State, that the Christian faces the difficulty of a dual approach. He meets his fellow-man no longer now as an individual with whom he has a personal relationship of love. He sees him here as an individual in society, as a fellow-worker, as someone with whom he has business relationships, as a fellow-member of some political group or of the State. Each of these Orders of community is human and sinful, even though God wills that man must take his part in them as a Divine Calling. Brunner sees no real solution of the world economic problem because, as he states, "the economic order oscillates continually between an individualism which destroys community and a collectivism which destroys freedom". In this the Christian has to work for the "better order", not only as an individual, but as part of the community always endeavouring to preserve the balance between the two economic and social extremes.

The author is right, in regard to the State, to lay very strong emphasis on the ever-present danger of the State's mistaking its function. It is not the function of the State to organize and control the other Orders of Community. The State should provide law, order and security within which the other Orders can best work. It is the protector against chaos, for in chaos none of the other Orders can function nor even Love can work. The Christian has therefore to beware of rebellion against the State because of the risk of the chaos which might ensue. The Christian should support change only when

that change is known to be for the better and is also possible of attainment. This seems to provoke in the mind of the reader the questions—"How does one know unless one tries whether the change is possible or better?" and "Is it not conceivable that the risk of chaos may be preferable to some forms of State government?"

The book concludes with a section on the Church. The nature of the Church is described, as one would expect, according to the Protestant Evangelical conception. This section would be more appropriate under the heading of Theology rather than of Ethics, except that the Church is included as one of the Orders in which the Christian finds himself. Like the other Orders, it is spoilt by human sin and prone to glorify itself and exalt itself above its proper function. He sees the weakness of the Church in the fact that it has lost the "living Word" and so has no real message for the present time.

It is on this rather pessimistic note that he ends, but the condemnation is not altogether unjustified. It is of value that at times someone should present clearly the weaknesses of the human individual and of society. This is a truly prophetic function which Brunner undertakes. The failure of man to realize his absolute dependence on God, and that his only true happiness lies in obedience to the Divine Will, lies at the root of all present-day disorders. This cannot be too often stressed and there is no doubt that this book brings home the truth of these words again and again. If Brunner's object was to make his reader think more deeply on these issues, rather than to compel agreement with his conclusions, then that object has been most successfully achieved. This book was written in 1932, but the lapse of nearly thirty years has in no way detracted from its importance. It still remains a valuable contribution to the study of Ethics and his assessments of the social, political, and economic situations are as relevant to-day as when they were first made.

JOHN COOK.

Letter from South-East Asia

THE resolution of the Council of the Church in South-East Asia at Rangoon in February of this year is worthy of some comment and explanation. The Council comprises the Bishops of Hong Kong, Rangoon, the Philippines, Singapore, Borneo and Korea, and their assistant bishops. They say "we believe that we have discovered through the Council . . . a real fellowship within our Church between Bishops stemming from different parts of the Anglican Communion. . . . We have found it (the Council) a meeting-place wherein common interests can be fruitfully discussed; and we believe . . . that the continuance of the Council . . . is essential at the present stage of the Church's life in this part of the world." After envisaging the possibility of a closer provincial set-up between certain of the member dioceses, which would not necessarily disrupt the Council itself, the resolution concludes: "in our view the Council should be

recognized as a new form of Episcopal Synod, competent to meet the special needs of the various dioceses, and as a consultative body, competent to formulate policy within its area. We therefore ask the Churches of the Anglican Communion through the Executive Officer whether they are prepared to extend this recognition to the C.C.S.E.A." The Anglican Executive Officer was present at the meeting of the Council.

In this age of province-making, South-East Asia is the Cinderella of the Anglican Communion. Indeed, in some ways it is remarkable to find five neighbouring dioceses (excluding here Rangoon, which is at the moment in the C.I.P.B.C.) which are not linked and strengthened by provincial ties, especially as four of the dioceses are still under the jurisdiction of Canterbury and must in fact represent the furthest outposts of the Lambeth Empire. Yet on consideration one can understand why a provincial organization of Anglican dioceses has been slow to develop in this part of the world. The dioceses are neighbours but they are not contiguous, and any full-scale provincial organization, providing for consultation between bishops, clergy and laity, would be prohibitively expensive. Then, again, the political, racial and religious backgrounds of the six dioceses could hardly be more disparate: Hong Kong and Borneo, though very different in themselves, almost the last enclaves of British colonialism; Rangoon and Malaya facing strong nationalistic governments allied to resurgent religious movements, though the religions are of course different, i.e. Buddhist and Mohammedan respectively; Korea with its tragic recent history and the Philippines with a skein hardly less tangled, though with the additional thread of a religious environment which is predominantly Roman Catholic.

Then, again, the provenance, jurisdictional allegiance, and canonical and liturgical traditions of the six dioceses are widely different. Singapore, Borneo and Korea, under the direct jurisdiction of Canterbury are the closest here, though even so they have their own diocesan constitutions, and in any case Korea is perhaps of them all the most *sui generis*. Hong Kong is still technically a member of the independent province of the Church in China (Chung Hua Sheng Kung Hui) and lives under the constitutions and canons of that Church, of which in the prevailing conditions the Archbishop of Canterbury is the trustee. Rangoon has a long tradition of the liturgy and canons of the C.I.P.B.C., even though ecclesiastical, political and racial exigencies are forcing her to turn away from the old British imperialistic provincial grouping to a more realistic tie-up with the Church in South-East Asia. Lastly, the Philippines diocese springs from an altogether different tradition, that of the P.E.C.U.S.A., and is therefore, on paper perhaps, the most difficult of all to assimilate. Yet to fail to do so would be to ignore what is the greatest single new factor for the Church in this part of the world—the forthcoming concordat of intercommunion, on the lines of the Agreement of Bonn, between P.E.C.U.S.A. and the Iglesia Filipina Independiente, the Independent Church of the Philippines, which, with its vigorous life, gifted leadership and membership of

over two millions, is the largest indigenous Church in South-East Asia.

Here, then, are the difficulties which have inhibited the formation of a province, but here at the same time are the stimulants which have fostered the embryonic life of the Council. The Council (minus Rangoon) first met in Hong Kong in 1955 under the aegis of the Advisory Council of Missionary Strategy, which was inaugurated at the Minneapolis Convention of 1953. Rangoon joined the Council at Manila in 1957, and since then the meetings have been as follows: Lambeth 1958, Kuchin 1960 and Rangoon in 1961. The bishops and assistant bishops have comprised the Council, but on occasions they have been joined by available clergy and laity, and some of them conferred with a party of Chinese clergy in Hong Kong in 1959. This is the background to the "real fellowship" to which the Rangoon resolution refers. There has, moreover, been one matter common, though in differing degrees, to all the dioceses which has concerned the Council at each of its meetings—that of the work of the Church among the Chinese of "the dispersion", i.e. the thirty-odd million Chinese scattered outside China throughout the world, one of the five missionary areas selected for special emphasis at Lambeth in 1958. (There are Chinese priests at work among their own people in London, San Francisco and New Zealand, but especially, of course, in South-East Asia.) This is work which requires common direction, common strategy and a "long-term plan of evangelism".[1] In this connexion the Council has discussed the administration of certain old funds and the raising of new ones, the vital problem of the recruitment and training of clergy (there are about fifty priests working among the Chinese of the dispersion, and "at a conservative estimate" fifty more are needed) and the adequate provision of vernacular literature. These are matters of common concern in South-East Asia. Then there are questions of evangelistic strategy, such as the possibility of new work in Thailand, which need and have received corporate discussion. Again, there are matters of particular interest to a single diocese, such as the division of the vast diocese of Borneo, which can be profitably discussed by the local episcopate, especially when one remembers how isolated the separate dioceses are. Lastly, the question of the formation of a South-East Asia province or its equivalent has been discussed since 1957 and has issued in the present resolution.

It will be clear, however, from what has already been said that no provincial organization of a type which has already been evolved will serve as a precedent or pattern for the development of the corporate life of the Church in South-East Asia. A quasi-province such as that which has been found suitable for Jerusalem, where the

[1] The problems of the Chinese dispersion are best set out in a report prepared for the 1960 Council by a special sub-committee of Bishops Hall, Koh and Wong in consultation with the Chinese clergy assembled in conference in Hong Kong in 1959. See also G. Baker, *Some Notes on the Church's Mission to the Chinese Diaspora* in the Occasional Bulletin of the Overseas Council of the Church Assembly (1961, No. 1, pp. 13–21).

Archbishop of Canterbury retains some control and jurisdiction, will hardly fill the bill. It would probably be impolitic in the present situation in Burma for the diocese of Rangoon to return to the jurisdiction, or even the semi-jurisdiction, of Canterbury, and it would be even more difficult to ask the diocese of the Philippines to take the same step; on the other hand, as has already been said, to leave the Philippines out of South-East Asian calculations would be totally unrealistic. Moreover, in the present political and religious situation there is no obvious metropolitical centre in this part of the world comparable to Jerusalem in the Near East. The Bishop of Hong Kong has been the elected chairman of the Council since its first meeting, and Hong Kong is in a sense the natural headquarters for work among the Chinese of the dispersion, but that does not mean that it should be the metro-political see. Another possible pattern for the Church in South-East Asia is that of the province of West Africa, which is a quasi-province temporarily under an episcopal synod and with an elected archbishop or presiding bishop. But here, again, there is the problem of the ultimate jurisdiction of Canterbury, and the constituent dioceses of the Province of West Africa were *ab initio* united in liturgy and doctrine; in their case the 1661 Prayer Book, the Ordinal and the Thirty-nine Articles. Again, another line of approach towards a province in South-East Asia may have been behind the terms of the recent appointment of the Bishop of Singapore, who seems to have been envisaged as in some way the Archbishop of Canterbury's personal representative in South-East Asia. But it is difficult to see how such a curiously nuncio-like arrangement, whereby one bishop was "responsible" for the affairs of another diocese to a distant metropolitan, can be justified in Anglican historical or theological tradition.

The bishops at Rangoon were therefore evidently right, if any move ahead is to be made from the Council, in asking for recognition as "a new form of episcopal synod". At the moment, however, the exact connotation of these words is vague, and before the Council can be recognized as a "quasi-province", or a step-towards-a-province, its responsibilities will evidently need closer definition. Perhaps these might include: first, the confirmation of episcopal elections within the area, together with, if necessary, some part in the actual election or recruitment of possible bishops; secondly, the corporate trusteeship of the various and different canons and formularies of the constituent dioceses, in much the same way as the Archbishop of Canterbury is at present trustee of the canons of the Sheng Kung Huei for the diocese of Hong Kong; and thirdly, as suggested, a general responsibility for the overall planning and direction of the work of the Church in this area. No doubt the bishops concerned are, or soon will be, conferring, in the first instance, with the two interested metropolitans and with the presiding bishop of P.E.C.U.S.A. It is a matter of no small importance for the strength, work and corporate life of the Anglican communion in South-East Asia.

BARRY TILL.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Mascall is a Student of Christ Church and Lecturer in the Philosophy of Religion in the University of Oxford.

The Rev. Colin Morris is Fellow and Chaplain of Pembroke College, Oxford.

The Rev. John Cook is Rector of Orwell, near Royston.

The Very Rev. Barry Till is Dean of Hong Kong.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

WHAT THE AFRICAN ORDINAND IS THINKING

Dear Sir,

What is disturbing about Fr David Caton's article, "What the African Ordinand is Thinking", in your April number, is not its lack of charity or sympathy for the African, in particular, the African ordinand. It is that he overdoes the charity and the sympathy. It is almost extravagant. This compels him to take up the false position of a benevolent superior who dispenses gratuitous psychiatric diagnosis.

This is particularly regrettable, because the second half of his treatise is first-class comment—really authentic—the concern about the divisions of the Church; the problems of missionary activity and evangelism; pastoral problems, etc., which haunt these conscientious young men at St Bede's Theological College. What a pity the flowing prose and abundant Christian charity are tarnished by a kind of paternalism which, I feel, is out of date. To me it seems unfair to label "the African mind" as "closer to the medieval than to the modern". Unfair both to the medieval as well as the African mind. The African mind obviously cannot boast of the sterling achievements of the medieval; and if the reference is to grosser aspects of the medieval mind, that does not seem to be in the best of taste. The African mind seeks fulfilment in the modern situation. That is what is important all the time.

This "recent examination paper set at St Bede's Theological College" seems to be an odd kind of fish. It used to be the custom at examinations to require students to answer questions. Now, on the contrary, the students are required to ask questions. Might not these observations and assessments have been more accurately gleaned in common room conversations over tea or during meals? Surely the symbolic White man in South Africa stands discredited in African eyes. He is a bully, an exploiter and the main obstruction to fuller self-realization, to responsible participation in affairs and to sharing in the fruits of the land. He is *not* a father, as the statement "Church and State are twin props of the social order, each symbolizing the fatherhood of the White man", would have us believe. To me, if one thing is certain and clear, it is that any good effective important change in South Africa will not be effected by White hands alone.

The question, "What is the best government policy over the next ten years?" is a fair academic question and in no way shows "an underlying conviction that an archbishop is a statesman who has more immediate influence over the politicians than public exhortations and rebuke". After all, the archbishop has pronounced on government policy and might reasonably be expected to have some general idea of an alternative to apartheid. It is this the questioner wants elicited. He wants to satisfy himself that, beyond doubt, the archbishop does not stand for some vague, modified, so-called humane form of segregation, as some people do. He wants the whole thing scrapped as soon as possible—in, say, ten years.

I squirmed with pain and indignation when I read this comment on another question, "But the questioner does not mean exactly what he says . . ." This kind of psychologizing is intolerable, and it is typical of those people who think they know better than we do what is good for us. May I also suggest that the dilemma—whether the African priests should side with the government or with the people—is exaggerated? Of course, they side and desire to side with the people. The worst that can be said of them is that they do not want to make it too obvious to *some* people. It is neither fair nor correct to expect the African ordinand—even with cursory attention to the facts of history and geography—to regard White leadership in Church as something entirely different from White leadership in State; as if those two have absolutely nothing to do with each other. After all, all the men and women who sit in parliament are baptized, professing Christians (or are supposed to be).

W. F. Kuse
(*An African Ordinand*).

St Paul's College,
Grahamstown.

CHRISTIANS AND NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

Dear Sir,

Because we want to see the issues more widely discussed I am sure that the article in your June issue, entitled "Christians and Nuclear Disarmament", will be welcomed by all of us who are active in the Christian Group of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament.

However, the authors are mistaken in thinking that we have not taken seriously the study and publications undertaken by various Christian individuals and organizations. It is precisely because we have taken them seriously and are most deeply concerned that there should be more thought and discussion at all levels that we have taken the trouble to publish our own views. If we have not yet answered "The Valley of Decision" it is for the very simple reason that it was published after our pamphlet "Questions and Answers for Christians on Nuclear Disarmament". Incidentally, your readers might be interested to know that the sentence in the pamphlet which suggests that not much is heard in church about the problems

connected with nuclear weapons, from which your writers have somehow drawn the conclusion that we are not aware of Christian concern about peace and war in the atomic age, was in fact a contribution to our thinking which originated from Canon T. R. Milford, later to become the author of "The Valley of Decision"! Some of us have made many endeavours to discuss the subject of nuclear weapons with ministers and with church groups, and it is from our own experience that we know that very little impact has been made or thought aroused by the work of study groups and commissions, or even by the suggestion of the Lambeth Conference that the subject is one which merits intense study and prayer.

Your authors chide us, saying that our publication has the result that "the universe of discourse explored in mutual respect and charity by pacifist and non-pacifist ever since the second world war is shattered from one side". How can this possibly be true since our pamphlet is in no sense a pacifist document? If Messrs Booth, Edwards and Jenkins seriously believe that we have endeavoured to make a pacifist case, then the "universe of discourse . . . since the second world war" does not seem to have led them to a very clear understanding of the nature of the pacifist position. Next we are accused of "indulging in a unilateral campaign of propaganda which shows no particular care to understand its opponents". Yet, as it were, almost in the next breath, some of us are commended for arranging a conference of people of varying views—good evidence, one would think, that we are trying to understand our opponents. If we do seem to put our propaganda in a unilateral manner it is largely because we experience great difficulty in finding responsible Christian supporters of the deterrent who will come and debate with us either in public or in private.

We are glad that your authors admit that it is questionable how far Britain's independent deterrent contributes significantly to stability—that is, to the balance of power on which so many base their hopes of uneasy peace. As they must know very well, there are many military experts who think that, in a situation in which both America and Russia have the ability to destroy each other's main centres of population and productive capacity many times over, the continuation of the expenditure of so much of this country's resources on the production of yet more nuclear weapons is futile. This is no doubt a thought to which some may find it difficult to adjust their ideas of national destiny and pride. Yet it places on Britain a responsibility of a new character, and one which she cannot possibly discharge whilst committed to nuclear weaponry—the supremely important responsibility of bridging the gap between East and West. Up to date there is no shred of evidence to suggest that Britain's contribution of nuclear weapons has facilitated disarmament. It has done nothing to curb the development of such weapons by France or the desire of other nations to possess such weapons. Nor can we assent to the suggestion put forward in the article that *Polaris*, with its nuclear load equivalent to all the high explosives used in the last war, can contribute to an "easing of nervousness"—

as if its existence in the world was something to be welcomed by Christians. If Messrs Booth, Edwards and Jenkins sleep more soundly in their beds because of *Polaris* we do not envy them; we prefer to be wakeful and warning men of the evil of preparing to destroy mankind with such clever inventions. Those who support the deterrent must face the fact that in the last resort they are willing to risk the use of such weapons in their name. No amount of clever calculation or wishful thinking about a limited nuclear war can mask this inescapable fact. To those who flirt with a limited nuclear war as a means to preserve the idea of a "just war", we commend the views of Mr Gilpatrick, Deputy Secretary of Defence of the U.S.A., as reported in *The Times* of 7 June 1961: "I do not know how you would build a limit into it when you use any kind of nuclear bang." Nor do we.

Polaris, the article assures us, is just the very thing to enable "the temperature to drop and the talking to begin"! But surely there has not been any lack of talking about disarmament—only of results. Have they not heard that for nearly three years there has been a conference about an agreement to stop testing nuclear weapons which, after so much talking, has arrived nowhere? Such, and only such, are the fruits of creating more armaments for the purpose of getting rid of armaments.

Much stress is laid in the article—and, indeed, in a great deal that is written from a similar point of view—on seeking the safety of mankind; from that premise it is then assumed and asserted that the popular expedient of the day—namely, the "great deterrent"—is invested with an infallibility of almost divine certitude; once satisfied on this score, it quite readily follows that to threaten our fellow men and women—enemies and neutrals alike—and, if necessary, to risk the act itself, is as good a contribution as Christians can hope to make to a peaceful world.

Safety is man's most natural desire; but it is not necessarily a Christian one. In fact, a most thoroughgoing disregard of the dictates of safety seems to characterize much that is most vital in the Christian teaching. When safety conflicts with our main objective—to try, as best we may, to do the will of God as shown to us through Christ—we are challenged in no uncertain terms as to where our real allegiance lies. Some may feel that allegiance to Christ is unlikely to lead us on to lines which always run parallel to the popular concept of safety as understood in the generally accepted terms of political and military expediency. Surely we could all agree, as a starting point, that no one can see with any degree of precision where safety lies; could we not go on from there to agree that, tempting though the quest for safety may be, we ought, nevertheless, to relinquish it and search instead for that course of conduct which is appropriate for the followers of Christ and that we ought then to advocate that course to others—even if it should not be what appears to us to be, in our limited knowledge, the safest course?

It is our sincere conviction that this is the right quest. It is in our endeavour to pursue it that our consciences have been quickened to

declare, with all the strength that we can muster, that we cannot accept the means of mass annihilation and fearful deterrence as a way open to those who seek, however inadequately and haltingly, to struggle towards a peace based on Christian understanding and love.

Yours sincerely,
FRANCIS JUDE
(Secretary of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, Christian Group).

P.S.—Within a few weeks we shall be publishing another pamphlet, entitled "Human Nature and the Dominion of Fear", by Prof. H. Butterfield. It will be obtainable from the C.N.D., 2 Carthusian Street, London, E.C.1. Price 9d.

THE MOTHERS' UNION

DEAR SIR,

In your June issue, Mr James, with great courtesy and restraint, voices the doubts and misgivings about the policy of the Mothers' Union which are clearly felt by a large number of clergy at the present time. The case against the Mothers' Union is stated thus: (1) The Mothers' Union, by virtue of its size and importance is *the* women's organization of the Church of England; (2) the Church, in certain cases and at the discretion of the bishop, admits to full membership those who have been divorced; (3) the Mothers' Union, as the Church's chief organization for women, should do the same.

At first sight this seems a strong case, but does it in fact hold water?

The Mothers' Union has never set out to be *the* women's organization of the Church. From its inception it has always recruited its members from a strictly limited class—married women who, among other things, desire to uphold the sanctity of marriage and who understand by the word "marriage" a permanent, life-long relationship between husband and wife. (Spinsters, who accept the principles of the Union, can be admitted to associate membership, but these have never comprised a significant part of the total strength.) It is, of course, true that these married women from whom the M.U. draws its members are very numerous in the Church and that over the years many of them have been enrolled, but the mere size of the organization has nothing whatever to do with its principles. These remain exactly what they were when there was only Mary Sumner's one branch, and I cannot see why we should ask them to be changed simply because there are now half a million women seeking to uphold them.

To argue that because the M.U. is now as large as a churchwomen's society would be, it should therefore become a churchwomen's society is unreasonable. The M.U. does not want to become a churchwomen's society. It wants to go on making its own particular witness

to the sanctity of marriage because it believes that this witness is vitally important.

This particular witness can only be borne by the particular women whom the M.U. invites to membership. It cannot be borne by divorcées. They can and do bear all sorts of other kinds of witness. They can be, and no doubt often are, good, holy, kind people who set an example to the rest of us by the quality of their lives. But, as witnesses to the permanence of the marriage relationship, they are a dead loss. In exactly the same way as the members of the M.U. would be a dead loss as witnesses to the power and beauty of virginity. It is not a question of blame or reproach, but of fact. Of course the M.U. should offer fellowship and help to those who have been divorced. Actually it does. Through its open meetings, through its literature, through its discussion groups and through the ordinary traffic of friendliness, the divorced woman in dozens of parishes is being helped and loved by members of the M.U. Everything is open to her—except membership, with its responsibility of a witness which she is unable to make.

But Mr James brings another and more serious charge. He says that the M.U., by refusing to receive into membership a divorced and remarried woman who has been admitted by the bishop to Communion, is not behaving as the handmaid of the Church, which it claims to be. Is not this charge based on a confusion between moral fitness and status?

The bishop, in such cases, is not declaring that the second union into which the divorced persons have entered is Christian marriage. Indeed, the regulations of Convocation to which Mr James refers make it quite plain that it is not Christian marriage. There must not be even a blessing in public lest confusion on this point might arise. What the bishop is doing is exercising his pastoral right to remit the penalties which would normally follow an open breach of the Church's marriage laws. Undoubtedly it is proper for the bishop to do this in certain circumstances, but by so doing he is not altering or denying the principle of the indissolubility of marriage. The second union remains "irregular" and something other than Christian marriage.

Whether the authorities in the M.U. are "fundamentalist" in their theology or not I do not profess to know, nor is the question of any relevance. The M.U. does not determine the Church's doctrine on marriage. It merely witnesses to it. And, both in its written constitution and in its practice, it is only expressing what is in fact the official mind of the Church.

To demand that the M.U. should go beyond Convocation and state, in effect, that there is no difference between Christian marriage and the second civil contract into which a divorcée has entered (for this is what the admittance of divorcées to full membership would necessarily imply) is to ask it to lead the Church in the matter of marriage doctrine. Is leading the function of a handmaid? Do we want the M.U. to lead us through this difficult and complex field? Are we not wiser if, instead of criticizing the M.U. for not being

something that it is not, we encourage and help it to be more effectively what it is—a society of women who, in marriage, are trying to live up to and to uphold the highest principles which they know.

I remain, Sir,
Yours faithfully,
✠ Basil Bedford.

Gravenhurst Rectory,
Bedfordshire.

BOOK REVIEWS

World Cultures and World Religions. By Hendrik Kraemer. Lutterworth Press. 1960. 35s.

In his great work *The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World* (written for the Tambaram Conference of 1938), Dr Kraemer set the terms for the dialogue concerning Christian Missions and the non-Christian religions which has continued ever since. In that book he challenged the tendency on the part of Christian apologists to search for points of parallelism and contact with other religions as being untrue and unjust to both sides. The great religions of the world must be studied as wholes, and the meaning of words like salvation and God must be understood in their own context. It is patronizing as well as untrue to represent Christianity as the Crown of Hinduism, as though the Hindus were looking for the same thing, but Christians knew how to get it. Christianity as a response to the once-for-all act of the transcendent God is different in kind.

In the present volume, Dr Kraemer, from the same standpoint, extends his view to cover the entire field of the dialogue between East and West (not, of course, in the upstart sense in which the East is identified with Communism); a dialogue which is partly cultural and partly religious. Since religion and culture in the East have been almost identical, there is no hard and fast line to be drawn, and, in fact, the greater part of his attention is given to the dialogue in religious terms. The bulk of the book is a review of the voluminous writings covering the last century and more in which this dialogue or multilogue (his word) is reflected. It is an astonishing achievement. In reading about Islam you would think that a lifetime's study had gone into that alone, but, in fact, Islam, as a deviant member of the biblical family of faiths, is marginal to the study, and it is India and China that are most significant in the over-all picture.

In the earlier stages the West was the aggressive force; both the exclusive claims of the Gospel and the sceptical scientific spirit being felt as a challenge to which the ancient religions of the East reacted in various ways—by self-criticism, by ingestion and by counter-attack. The most interesting section in this historical review, which comes down to the present day, is the description of the counter-invasion of the West by Eastern religions, particularly various forms of Buddhism. In the first stage this was due to the discoveries of

Western scholars themselves, popularized in such works as *The Light of Asia*. Swami Vivekananda's appearance at the Chicago Parliament of Religions inaugurated the next stage, but even more significant to-day is the spread by "osmosis" of innumerable movements and still more of vaguely apprehended ideas both on the edge of and outside the churches which look to the ancient wisdom of the East to save the West from its self-induced frustrations.

Looking into the future, Dr Kraemer sees the dialogue as only just beginning. East and West alike are caught up into the technological revolution which is producing one world hostile to religion as such. The "clean universals" (in Hocking's phrase), mathematics, science and technics, are no longer felt by the East to be borrowed, but belong to all mankind. It is an open question how far this secular unification will supersede the traditional religions altogether, and reduce the scale of their dialogue. But meanwhile the actual religions all carry their past with them, and there is no prospect of a "religion" in the singular which will fulfil them all and become the religion of the technically unified world. Nor can it be taken for granted that the world will grow into one merely because the alternative is disintegration.

In entering into the "dialogue", Kraemer insists that Christians must not be deceived at the outset by the specious broadmindedness which takes as its starting point the dogma that all religions are at bottom the same. The intransigeance of Christianity is not spiritual imperialism, as Radhakrishnan thinks, but follows inevitably from the fact of God incarnate once for all in Christ, crucified and risen. If this is understood, inter-religious conversations are by all means to be pursued. If we ask what end is to be achieved by them, beyond mutual understanding, which is always good, the answer is not so clear. Is it a common front against secularism? But that would imply the search for the religion behind the religions, which has already been discarded. "Naturalistic monism" might conceivably come to terms with modern man-centred civilization, but in Dr Kraemer's opinion Christianity could not.

Perhaps the chief effect of the dialogue would be on Christianity itself. Are the intensely personal categories of the Bible the only and finally sufficient forms in which to experience and describe the divine nature and man's relations to it? Is there room in Christian experience and theology for the mystical, timeless, passive element? Is the fact that modern man responds to this in East and West alike a sign of truth or a temptation to be avoided? If there is any compromise on this point, shall we find that the personal categories are relegated to the status of "lower truth" (aparamavidya) and the mystics' impersonal approach exalted as leading to ultimate truth (paramavidya)? Kraemer's own view is clear, but it is not the only one which Christians have taken or can take.

In the post-Tambaram volume, *The Authority of the Faith* (1939), Dr Kraemer said: "Another question of great importance is: if it is true that there is much that is true, good and beautiful in the non-Christian religions, what is their relation to God and His working

in man, 'for God does not abandon the work of His hands'? In this connection we also come to grips with the problem of the religious (i.e. God-related) meaning of science, art, philosophy and the experience of the numinous." If light can be thrown on this ultimate question by the accumulation of facts, Dr Kraemer ought to be able to answer it. In fact, as far as I can see, he stands where he stood in 1938, with the question still unanswered.

In a sense the whole vast multilogue is about this; and whether *both-and* or *either-or*, or both *both-and* and *either-or*, are the way of truth will presumably become clear "in that day" when we know even as we are known. And meanwhile surely we can recognize the hand of the Holy Spirit both in the clarity of Dr Kraemer's own witness to the uniqueness of Christ, and in the charity with which he enters into the minds of those whom he reports on.

T. R. Milford.

The Master's House,
The Temple.

The Religious Orders in England. Vol. III, The Tudor Age. By Dom David Knowles. Cambridge University Press. 1959. 55s.

With this volume Prof. Knowles concludes the majestic survey of monastic life in medieval England which he began thirty years ago. Despite the singularly unpropitious time of its appearance, his first volume won instant renown. If the two volumes which followed were somewhat less exciting, this was in large measure because his subject had lost some of its sparkle. The dramatic age of pioneering was over, apart from the advent of the friars, and the monks and nuns of England settled down to an existence which was normally as humdrum as that of a modern clergy house. His final volume covers the age in which drama returns in the form of tragedy, and the monasteries which had done so much to convert England were left to become gaunt ruins or converted into "desirable residences".

The book falls into two parts—a consideration of the decades immediately preceding the dissolution of the monasteries under Henry VIII, and a detailed survey of the process of their suppression. The first part is particularly important for, as the author rightly claims, "the eighty-seven years between the death of Henry V and the accession of Henry VIII have come to form a kind of interlunary period shunned by 'medievalists' and 'modernists' alike". To reconstruct the spirit of this, as of most remote ages, is a highly difficult task, depending, as it does, on an appreciation of traditions and modes of thought often so deeply imbedded in society as to be taken for granted by contemporaries and therefore seldom obvious in the documents on which later historians perforce rely. Prof. Knowles' picture shows all the insight we expect from him, and should be made compulsory reading for all studying the Tudor Church or Age. Though unspectacular piety was very far from absent, there was much to amend in contemporary manners, which were very far from perfect. "It is an earthy, selfish, grasping age," he writes. And it

would not require a considerable degree of bigotry for an informed student to dissent from his comment that "they (the monks) were to find every new influence a hostile one, in a grasping and acquisitive society which had as its characteristic quality a keen appreciation of the main chance". His conclusion to the whole problem of the Dissolution is as fresh as it is convincing: "There is an analogy even if only a partial and distant one between the fortunes of the monks between 1450 and 1535 and the fortunes of the English landed aristocracy between 1900 and to-day. In both cases a class of great wealth and social influence lost much of its power and prestige not precisely through any degeneration on its own part, but by reason of revolutionary social and economic changes in the world around it, and through the consequent changes of sentiment in its regard" (p. 7).

Inevitably other historians might lay different stress on particular details. To the reviewer it would seem that the social sacredness of "the squire and his relations" was much alive even in these times. In virtue of it a retiring prior of Mountjoy claimed not only due provision for board and lodging but also "a servant to wait uponn hym as a gentleman haught to have"; the Jesuit Gerard found it useful once or twice, whilst it certainly explains the extremely lavish provision made for heads of monasteries at the time of their suppression, to which the author draws attention. Some would have welcomed fuller discussion of how the man in the monastery thought about the papacy. Was it an uninformed, rather hazy allegiance, much undermined by a devotion to the monarchy which Irish Catholic or English Anglican alike to-day can barely visualize, let alone share?

The process of the suppression of the monasteries of medieval England has attracted a good deal of research in the last half-century, and the elaborate documentation available has been so intensively studied that many of its main features are no longer a matter of controversy. Here one must admire the author's immense industry and skill in digesting and presenting so vividly an enormous mass of material. He uses neglected and unpublished material as well as the stock sources and considers all the main facets of monastic life. The picture of the suppression he paints completely supersedes that given in Baskerville's *English Monks and the Suppression of the Monasteries* (1937), a book whose reputation has hitherto stood a good deal higher than its historical merits would warrant. No Anglican or Protestant could well quarrel with Prof. Knowles' judgment, "it is at least permissible to conclude that neither the desire nor the hope of reforming the religion of England had any part in determining the actions of Henry and Cromwell", though they might not accord quite the same amount of space as he does to the consideration of the immensely heroic handful of religious who resisted Henry VIII to the death. An interesting pendant to the story which will be new to many readers is the attempt to revive the monastic life in England under Queen Mary.

The sources for English monastic history are immense, despite the appalling losses of manuscripts and archives which accompanied the

Dissolution, and Prof. Knowles' studies have not put future Ph.D.s on the subject out of business. But he has given us a major study in Church history which is unlikely to require substantial emendation for a very long while to come.[1]

J. C. Dickinson.

Birmingham University.

Landmarks in Liturgy. By G. A. Michell. Darton, Longman and Todd. 1961. 18s.

The Dynamics of Liturgy. By H. A. Reinhold. Macmillan, New York. 33s.

Each of these titles indicates clearly the author's approach to his subject. For Dr Michell liturgy is a map spread out, much of which remains to be filled in, but with certain landmarks fixed for all time. For Fr Reinhold it is a process in motion, full of exciting possibilities of development. Yet both plead for revision, and both appeal to the age of Ambrose, Augustine and Chrysostom as the golden age of liturgy.

Dr Michell traces the history of the liturgy from Justin Martyr to Bishop Cosin, dividing it into six sections: Ante-Communion, Offertory, Consecration, Fraction, Communion, and Post-Communion. This undoubtedly makes for clarity, and the obvious danger of repetition is avoided with great skill. On the other hand, one loses the chance of considering the rite in any of its successive stages as a whole. Texts are quoted on a very generous scale, even including the entire Canon of 1549, which every reader will surely possess; and there are six appendices usefully printing documents such as the letter to the Bishop of Gubbio, which are more often quoted from than read. The reader is not required to be able to read Latin for himself, though such terms as "Mozarabic" and "neum" are left unexplained; and there is a similar change of level when we reach chapter 3. The first two chapters are a model of lucid exposition for students, but the discussion of Consecration introduces one of Dr Michell's special interests (we already owe to him an excellent pamphlet on "Eucharistic Consecration in the Primitive Church"), and we find ourselves in an atmosphere of scholarly controversy and hypothesis. This is only partly dictated by the subject-matter.

Like other experts in the patristic field, Dr Michell is less than fair to Cranmer. The 1552 Book, in particular, is hardly discussed at all: Prof. Ratcliff's article in the *J.E.H.* for October 1956 would have helped here. Too much is made of the "Anglican principle of conformity with the primitive church": references to the "ancient fathers" in the documents are easier to find than examples of their influence. Any addition or alteration to the rite of the patristic period is described as an innovation, unless it is by Richard Baxter.

[1] *Errata* of any kind are very few and of minor importance, but Luther's "three great pamphlets" (p. 55), are usually held to include the *Appeal to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation* and not the *de votis monasticis*.

when it is a "novel invention". But Dr Michell is an excellent guide to the earlier centuries, and his book is moderately priced.

Fr Reinhold has collected twenty-two articles written over as many years, and best read in small doses. There is some overlapping, especially in the essays on Lent. Much of what he says has been made familiar by the Liturgical Movement in this country also. The meatiest essay is on "Art, Architecture, and the Christian", which speaks directly to the Anglican condition. Fr Reinhold argues strongly for "vernacular in the liturgy" (*not* the liturgy in vernacular), but he is very much aware of the dangers of translation: "What I am personally afraid of . . . is a commission of professors who know all about their fields but do not speak the language of the people, or the saints, or the poets . . . who will smooth over, streamline, modernize . . . what they find. And then we shall be stuck with it." Food for Anglican thought here too. Some day we shall have to admit the vernacular to the B.C.P. There is a fascinating glimpse of American Roman Catholicism: "Holy Name men, sodality girls, Knights [of Columbus], Catholic Daughters, St So-and-So Guild . . . coming up together, countable, orderly, like a sacred team." Not unnaturally, he wants to substitute the Family Communion. He is very good, too, on Christmas.

It is all good journalism, full of vivid writing and striking phrases, thoroughly readable, but crying out for expansion and more supporting evidence. Even as it stands, it would make a desirable paper-back; unfortunately, the price in this country is 33 shillings.

G. J. Cuming.

Billesdon,
Leicester.

Elizabeth I and the Religious Settlement of 1559. By Carl S. Meyer. Concordia Publishing House, St Louis. 1960. $4.95.

Most revolutions go gently until they are sure that they are in the saddle and capable of defeating every form of resistance. At the Restoration of Charles I the high churchmen were at first moderate and later decisive against the Presbyterians. In the settlement under Queen Elizabeth the government was at first moderate, rather Catholic, rather Lutheran, and then becoming ever more decisively reformed in its behaviour. The puzzle of the settlement is to know how far the government knew where it was going, how far it was being conservative out of policy or conviction, and how far, as it moved towards the left, it was moving because it was pushed along by the tide of public feeling and the popular reaction against the Marian regime. It is a puzzle principally because much depends on the extent of Elizabeth's personal power in her first few months as sovereign, and much upon a diagnosis of her own religious point of view. On neither of these points is there a great deal of reliable information. She was certainly a Protestant, for unless she was a Protestant she was probably illegitimate. She instructed Oglethorpe, the Bishop of Carlisle, officiating in the royal chapel, to omit the eleva-

tion of the Host and when he refused she left the chapel after the reading of the Gospel. At the state opening of Parliament she was met by the abbot and monks of Westminster Abbey (Mary's revived foundation) bearing lighted tapers, and she said, "Away with these torches, for we see well."

Was it, then, her own opinions which drove her onward in reform, and was she restrained only by the power of the Catholic opposition, the "many learned" who in Parliament spoke against the proposed changes? Yet soon the government was omitting the petition in the Litany against the Bishop of Rome and his detestable enormities, adding the 1549 words of eucharistic administration to the 1552 form, removing the Back Rubric from the liturgy, and regulating ceremonies by the extremely conservative Ornaments Rubric. It seems impossible to doubt that the government intended to find room within the Church for the many Catholic-minded persons who disliked the incoming reformers but were content with a vernacular liturgy, a humanist reform, a married clergy, communion in both kinds, and freedom from the legal interferences of the Pope. And the little that is known about Elizabeth's own religion suggests that this conservative humanist reformation was that which suited her temperament, cynical though she might be after her various experiences. She certainly preferred archbishops of Canterbury to be unmarried, and she was perhaps at the bottom of the regulations which tried to secure that the Anglican clergy did not make unsuitable marriages.

This book, intended as a centenary volume, gives a steady narrative of these proceedings, so that it is possible to observe the changing pattern of settlement in the first years of the reign.

Owen Chadwick.

Selwyn College,
Cambridge.

The Christian's Knowledge of God. By W. W. Bryden. James Clarke and Co. 1960. 15s.

Dr Bryden's book is a lucid and forceful statement of the theological position which is usually known as Barthian. In the first three chapters the corroding of traditional Christian belief by historical criticism and Idealist philosophy is described and condemned. Next the nature of New Testament revelation is considered, and its uniqueness emphasized against those who regard the essence of Christianity as in any sense analogous to that of other religions. The gradual formulation of doctrine by the early Church is displayed as the preserving of the supernatural, and so paradoxical, essence of the Word of God, against the rationalizations of the heretics. In the last chapter, "Conceptions of God and Knowledge of God", man's speculation about God and God's Word to man are set in absolute contrast; and the book ends with a truly prophetic tirade against the contemporary Church's compromise with the ideals and aspirations

of society, and the resulting pusillanimity and ineffectiveness of her teaching.

To do justice to all the arguments in this highly provocative work would be impossible in a brief compass. Most readers will feel that the polemic against the extremes of 19th-century liberal theology is at least partly justified—that it tended to conform Christianity to its own moral values and the exigencies of Idealist philosophy. But all human communication, including preaching, demands assumptions and thought-forms common to speaker and hearer; and it may be urged that while the liberal is so intent on finding a common language that he forgets he has anything distinctive to say in it, the Barthian seems to behave like the Englishman abroad; whenever he is misunderstood he can only repeat himself in a louder voice. When Dr Bryden condemns both Liberals and Scholastics for rationalizing that which is above reason, he does not seem to distinguish between change in the content of the Christian message and change in the manner of presentation. Surely it is the strength rather than the weakness of the Christian claims that they can be couched in terms drawn from so many religious and philosophical systems; and harm is done only if these are taken as a substitute for, rather than as an auxiliary to, the language of the Bible and the Creeds.

The popular insistence on paradox as an important constituent of theological language, which Dr Bryden adopts, requires more explanation than theologians have so far been prepared to give. It is important to distinguish very clearly between the kind of paradox that reveals profound truth, and the kind that is merely a symptom of conceptual muddle.

Hugo Meynell.

Cambridge.

SHORTER NOTICES

A Scientist who Believes in God. By H. N. V. Temperley. Hodder and Stoughton. 1961. 15s.

This is a charming and honest book. Dr Temperley has described his own pilgrimage to faith with no attempt to hide the difficulties or what he feels to be the weak points in his arguments. As an exercise in humble Christian apologetics his book is a model of charity. But while I have nothing but admiration for its temper, its contents left me feeling very depressed. Its title sounded the first warning note. And the more I read the more it became apparent what a gulf there is to-day between the ordinary intelligent scientifically minded layman and the professional theologian. Nowadays it seems to be the theologians who doubt and the scientists who believe. Dr Temperley argues against an opponent whom he calls "the materialist", a word which seems to have a curiously old-fashioned ring; he bases a large part of his case on the occurrence of odd events in nature; he leads us to a God who "once this universe was created, . . . has interfered with it as little as possible, (though) He can and

does intervene from time to time"; he explains evil largely as a result of trial and error by God; he accepts the Divinity of Christ on the basis of his claim before the High Priest; and his main argument in favour of miracles is the historical accuracy of Luke. I would not wish to deny Dr. Temperley's faith. My only aim is to point out how a highly critical and competent mind in one field of study can fail to grasp the real seriousness of unfamiliar problems.

J. S. Habgood.

Westcott House,
Cambridge.

All the Birds of the Bible. By Alice Parmelee. Lutterworth Press. 1960. 30s.

This handsomely produced book with 64 pages of good illustrations is printed in the U.S.A. and, as the title suggests, is an exhaustive account of biblical bird life.

The author loves and knows both birds and the Bible, and her study does add to our understanding of the Bible. For instance, she compares "the still small voice" of God with the soft and low cooing of the dove, and she shows how doves have been associated with man from the earliest days. At times there is a slightly jarring fundamentalist note in spite of a knowledge of linguistic and textual difficulties. This may be due to an over fanciful reconstruction of some scenes. There is a great deal of accurate and interesting ornithological data and one or two full sketches of individual species. Taken as a whole it is a charming and readable book, suitable for a present, and for the serious student of the Bible.

Ian R. Carrick, O.G.S.

Irene, Transvaal.

The Shape of Death. By Jaroslav Pelikan. Abingdon Press. 1961. $2.25.

Life and Death. Edited by A. G. Reynolds. Lutterworth Press. 1960. 6s.

Dr Pelikan's book contains the Laidlaw Lectures delivered at Knox College, Toronto, in 1959. He examines the thought of five of the Fathers on death, sums up the distinctive approach of each in a symbol taken from plane geometry, and assesses their contribution to our understanding of the gospel.

First comes the heretic Tatian, whose shape is "the arc of existence", and who "in answer to man's aspirations and pretensions . . . declares that man cannot by his own powers leap across the boundaries of his existence". But polemic against the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul is not enough, and so the teaching of Clement of Alexandria is studied next, under the heading "the

circle of immortality". Clement is praised for his attempt to express biblical teaching about the soul in terms of Greek philosophy, for Dr Pelikan regards the refusal to borrow Greek categories of thought in favour of "the clear teachings of the Bible" as irresponsible. "Either Christians are not to speak about the soul in any consistent and reasoned manner at all, or they must be willing to learn about the soul from other places, in addition to their Scriptures." Cyprian's teaching is summed up by "the triangle of mortality", whose horizontal dimension is provided by the justified hopes of natural religion for life after death, and whose vertical dimension is "the believer's hope for divine intervention to grant him the life after death that he cannot achieve for himself".

But all of this is not enough, for somehow or other the crisis of the arc and the continuity of the circle have to be combined. This was achieved by Origen in "the parabola of eternity" and by Irenaeus in "the spiral of history". "The two arms of the parabola are the pre-existence of souls, which includes their prehistorical fall, and the eventual restoration of all things." Since, however, both these doctrines are theologically suspect, the best answer seems to be that of Irenaeus. The first turn of his spiral is provided by fallen humanity, Adam; the second turn is the doctrine of recapitulation, in which Christ's life follows the shape of Adam's but takes human existence further; and the third turn is the new life now possible for the believer.

It is impossible to do justice to Dr Pelikan's argument in such a brief summary. His book is of great value for its contribution to the much-discussed problem of the meaning of death, not least because his thought is fresh and manages to find a new form of presentation. Presumably the book is not intended for patristic specialists, since there are no footnotes; at the same time it would have been desirable to include full references to the Fathers, secondary authorities, and all the passages of scripture quoted.

Life and Death is an account of the biblical teaching on life after death produced by the Committee on Christian Faith of the United Church of Canada. It shows acquaintance with much modern scholarship and should be of use to study groups, but is unfortunately very weak on the Old Testament. This is most obvious when Dan. 12. 2 is claimed as evidence for a general resurrection; in fact, the passage speaks only of the resurrection of some. Many will doubt whether it is at all helpful to speak of eternal life as "unending life". Purgatory is rejected for 16th-century reasons, though "the view that the life after death may be one of growth in grace and progress towards perfection" is not excluded. Prayer for the dead is favoured on similar grounds. There is a misprint on p. 88, and n. 1 on p. 83 should be rewritten.

B. A. Mastin.

Peterhouse,
Cambridge.

Out of Africa's Crucible. By Colin Morris. Lutterworth Press. 1960. 7s. 6d.

God and His People. By A. Leonard Griffith. Lutterworth Press. 1960. 5s.

Because of its title, and because it belongs to a series called "Preaching for To-day", Mr Morris' book has to be judged twice—once as preaching and once as a book about Africa. Those who were brought up to believe that a sermon ought to be an exposition of a text will not care for the book as preaching. Mr Morris, for instance, delivers a talk on "Road Safety" on the text from 1 Samuel, "There is but a step between me and death". As a book on Africa: there are the irritating archaisms ("God forfend" appears much too often), there are the repetitions inevitable in a collection of occasional papers, but one has to admire Mr Morris' realistic wisdom. A South African can derive little comfort from the fact that there are precisely the same sins in the much less blackguarded Federation, but he might learn a great deal from the author's frank recognition that the real people to be reckoned with are not the "responsible", the "moderate" or the "reliable" Africans (or Cypriots or Algerians, I suppose), but the political leaders who want real political rights. Mr Morris does not plead for a jamborally of all-the-moderates, but that the extremists should be willing to treat one another as human beings. Perhaps the best thing of all (because simplest and most dignified) is a sermon preached to Africans on the duty of converting the white man by prayer, by patience and forgiveness.

Mr Griffith's book is also one of a series—the Lenten Booklets of the United Church of Canada. It is written in the form of sermon or study notes, with ideas, anecdotes and quotations, interspersed with prayers (some traditional, some like "Strengthen thy Church's backbone, O Lord . . ."). It is built up on the letters to the churches in the Apocalypse and deals with the theme of judgment and renewal, i.e. the Church's need to find new life through death and resurrection. Any author who sets out to point the dullness of the Church in practice, must find it hard to convey his enthusiasm without getting lost in jargon, and Mr Griffith is surprisingly penetrating at times. He sees that it is just as important to be "resurrected" about planned-giving as about more old-fashioned things. The book does not, of course, tell us how to set about being renewed (except to stress penitence) for it is part of its theme that renewal is essentially God's work and not ours.

Peter Hinchliff.

Rhodes University,
Grahamstown, S.A.

Together in Britain. Published for the Church Assembly Board for Social Responsibility by the Church Information Office. 3s.

One of the weaknesses of the Church of England, in spite of notable exceptions, has been its failure to give detailed guidance on

practical social issues. Where it has been clear on questions of individual morality, it has seldom got beyond vague generalities on social morality. This "Christian Handbook on Race Relations" is a step in the right direction. The practical problem of race relations in Britain, which for many people is a relatively new one, is seen in theological terms. Purely emotional attitudes are undermined by presentation of the biological, social and historical facts. The sensitive suggestions for Christian action are particularly good. Group action is stressed rather than individual action, but there is a healthy reminder that group attitudes are changed by individual conviction. Three useful appendices contain information on "The Dutch Reformed Church in South Africa and Apartheid", "A list of useful books", and "A list of organizations concerned with race relations".

We should like to see the social thinking of Christians educated by a similar treatment of other topical problems.

MARGARET KANE.

SHEFFIELD.

UNITY, UNIFORMITY IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH. By S. C. Clark. Mowbray. 1961. 7s. 6d.

A TESTAMENT OF TURNING. By Donet Meynell Roelofs. Mowbray. 1961. 10s. 6d.

Both the Evangelical revival and the Tractarian movement left behind them benefits and, with their superficial contradictions, a situation which some see as doctrinal comprehension and others as confusion and chaos. We are familiar with the tensions, at any rate in outline, and the welcome signs to-day of drawing together across the "party" lines. Mr Clark has done a noble service to the whole Church of England (Liberal modernism is a branch line closed to traffic) by analysing, contrasting and comparing the apparently conflicting views which many, less clear-sighted than he, think are the shame and degradation of it to-day. Are the conflicts really as deep as many suppose they are? Are the manifold little pimbles of Anglican awfulness really more than outward and visible signs of petty-mindedness taking the place of sound learning? It is not a matter of ritual or ceremonial, but of scholarship which must be made to count. The sort of question this book provokes is whether "central churchmanship" is the bond which makes for comprehension or the road to chaos? There are both gaps and over simplifications. Neither the reformers nor the Caroline divines, though both are mentioned, receive consideration. Here, possibly, brevity becomes misleading, for the book presupposes some knowledge of Anglican history. The "simple" approach to scripture of the Evangelicals does not wholly tally with the "perfection" of scripture as, e.g., in *The Book of Homilies*; and, on the other hand, Catholics are not quite so wedded to the mystical interpretations of scripture as Mr Clark seems to think. Nevertheless, we have to look to the future as well as the past. As an introduction to Anglicanism of the 21st century this is a most worthwhile book. It is well suited for

study circles; it must be digested if the Church is to reflect the whole fulness of Christ.

A Testament of Turning, a series of letters (much revised it would seem), tells of the journey from doubt and scepticism to conviction and faith by an intelligent American wife and mother. They contain some insights which are worth having, even though they appear to be less mature than the author thinks they are. A book which it is better to have with all its irritations perhaps than not to have at all.

Ewen Farm House,
Nr Cirencester. W. S. Boycott.

The Atonement and the Sacraments. By Robert S. Paul. Hodder and Stoughton. 1961. 30s.

A Plain Man Looks at the Cross . By Leslie D. Weatherhead. Wyvern Books. Epworth Press. 1961. 2s. 6d.

Was Christ's Death a Sacrifice? By Markus Barth. Oliver and Boyd. 1961. 7s. 6d.

"Is it really necessary?" is the question which one asks of any new book on the Atonement. There is such a vast literature on that subject already. For 293 of its 387 pages *The Atonement and the Sacraments* merely repeats material already available, and often more fairly presented, in existing works. The real purpose of the volume is not revealed until Part III—the only part specifically on the Sacraments—which in its present setting has all the appearance of a brief (94 pages) appendix to just another "History of Atonement Theories". The first two parts are further marred by numerous misprints—one of them in one of only two places where Hebrew is quoted (p. 24).

"An attempt to explain in simple language for the modern man the significance of the death of Christ" (the sub-title of Dr Weatherhead's book) suggests that we have here the book for which every preacher has been waiting. Whatever the "Plain Man" may think, however, the serious student will want to question Dr Weatherhead's "bold and unorthodox" thesis that Caesarea Philippi constitutes a "second temptation" in the life of Christ, a temptation in which, after a shattering experience of rejection, apparently totally unexpected by our Lord, he realizes the Cross is inevitable and so considers ways and means in which it can be made the means of redemption. This thesis might meet with greater acceptance if it were supported by arguments and evidence more convincing than a constantly repeated "I have come to feel that . . ." (pp. 24, 27, 29, 30, 33) and by a more honest use of Scripture than that which constructs a theory of the consciousness of Christ on Heb. 5. 8 by omitting "obedience" from the text.

The Death of Christ a Sacrifice? is No. 9 in the Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers. It is a severely restricted study of some select passages in the New Testament in which Christ's death is described in sacrificial terms. These are studied in relation to the

concept of sacrifice in the Old Testament. This book thus earns its place on any bookshelf along with the work of Buchanan Gray and Vincent Taylor, to which it is a valuable supplement and corrective in the light of subsequent biblical study. One hopes for more works after this style, in particular for something which will investigate the relation of the Christus Victor motif in the New Testament to the revelations of the British Myth-Ritual School and the Scandinavians about Kingship and the cultus in the Old Testament.

St Stephen's House, Oxford. N. L. A. Tidwell.

God, Christ and Pagan. By M. I. Boas. Allen and Unwin. 1961. 25s.

Contemporary Psychology and Christian Belief and Experience. By Malcolm A. Jeeves. Tyndale Press. 1960. 1s. 6d.

Biology, Psychology and Belief. By W. H. Thorpe. Cambridge University Press. 1961. 4s. 6d.

Dr Boas, who is a Dutch psychiatrist now living in California, draws a sharp distinction between religion and paganism. The pagan is the man who selfishly hopes to realize his fundamental needs by doing certain acts which have the approval of supernatural forces, whereas "the aim of the religious man is to *be* what he thinks he *must be*" (p. 8). In *God, Christ and Pagan*, Christianity is stripped of its pagan accretions and a selection of Jesus' puzzling parables is re-interpreted. Jesus of Nazareth, "the rejected man . . . no one was able or willing to understand" (p. 161), was supremely religious. He wished to liberate men from "the grim duty of sacrifice and ritual" (p. 179) into which the pure Mosaic religion had been distorted, by inducing them to love God with an emotional attitude far nobler than spiritual self-interest. After his death, Jesus' followers soon discovered that the new teachings lacked driving-power in competition with those of Mithras and the Mysteries. The idea of the Divine Sufferer and the promise of eternal life were psychologically necessary to give status and meaning to the lives of the poor, the suffering and the oppressed. By the time the Evangelists were writing (and still more in the later Church), the pagan need for a system of theology, ritual, liturgy, fixed prayers, rules and neo-Pharisaic moralism had perverted the original teaching; and the pagan need for an authoritarian figure to back up the demands of religion had produced the miracle-stories of the Jesus who by now had become divine. Christianity is the product of the ineradicable paganism within Everyman.

Somehow, we seem to have heard it all rather often before. Most of us will need far more evidence than Dr Boas gives us before we reject the view that he has approached the Gospels with his own presuppositions and excised whatever is uncongenial to him, much as Marcion did, and with as little critical acumen.

Both Prof. Jeeves' address to the Research Scientists' Christian

Fellowship and Dr Thorpe's Eddington Memorial Lecture deal with "science and religion". Prof. Jeeves reassures us that psychology and Christian faith are not incompatible; Dr Thorpe ranges more widely and is more stimulating because he introduces us to a continuing debate. He discusses the origin and evolution of life, liaison between brain and mind, the mentality of animals and the unity of man's moral, aesthetic and scientific experience. Whilst quite sure where he himself stands, he leaves us free to make up our own minds.

RIPON HALL,
OXFORD.

MICHAEL C. PERRY.

CHRIST'S RESURRECTION. By P. Bourgy, O.P. Challoner Press. 1961. 7s. 6d.

Christ's resurrection, says Fr Bourgy, is a central vantage point from which to consider the total Christian life; so he makes it central to the plan of his book by prefacing his chapters on the resurrection and the Risen Christ by ones on sin and death (Christ's and ours) and by following them with a discussion on our own risen life as present reality and expected consummation.

We have often been told that the resurrection only unveiled the salvation which had already been wrought on the Cross. If so, what *is* a book on the resurrection but a manifestation of the effects of the Cross? And (see 2 Cor. 5. 1) will our own future resurrection only be a revelation of what we have already become? Yes, says Fr Bourgy. Because we are now living in the last times, the final *parousia* will be (p. 61) "full and clear manifestation of all that was given potentially at the beginning"; but most of us Christians are doing far less than we should to show forth our present risen-ness. In a penetrating chapter on "The Life of the Risen Christian", he lays bare the costliness of that life. Anyone who can read it without flinching is either already perfect or still dead.

RIPON HALL,
OXFORD.

MICHAEL C. PERRY.

BOOK NOTES

We have received a new and revised edition of *Notes on the History of the Early British (Celtic) Church* A.D. 1–680 by T. H. Florence: it is obtainable from the author at 36, Glenmore Road, Oxton, Birkenhead (4s. 10d. post free). Suzanne de Diétrich's *Free Men: Meditations on the Bible To-day* (S.C.M. Press, 8s. 6d.) will not need to be commended to those who are familiar with her previous books. The Bishop of Accra has authorized a version of the Book of Common Prayer for use by the Anglican Church of Ghana (Cambridge University Press, 7s. 6d.) until such time as the Church of the Province of West Africa produces its own revision: Hymns A. and M. are bound up with it. *A Theology of the Living Church* by L. Harold DeWolf (Hamish Hamilton, 35s.) is a revised edition of a one-volume systematic theology that was first published in the U.S.A. in 1953; the author is a professor at Boston University. *Pastoral Care in a Changing World* by Erastus Evans (Epworth Press, 8s. 6d.) is the work of a Methodist theologian who is also a psychologist. The latest addition to "The Library of Christian Classics" is a new translation of Calvin's *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (S.C.M. Press, £6 6s.). The editor is J. T.

McNeill and the translator is F. L. Battles, but many other scholars collaborated in the work. Both as regards the text and the accuracy and modernity of the translation this edition replaces earlier English versions, and it should be found in all theological libraries. From Oliver and Boyd comes another volume of their new translation of Calvin's Commentaries (see THEOLOGY, February 1960, p. 85): this one covers *The Gospel according to St John 11–21 and the First Epistle of John* (25s.). *Forbes Robinson: Disciple of Love,* edited by M. R. J. Manktelow (S.P.C.K., 9s. 6d.), contains selections from his letters and addresses, and will serve to introduce this greatly gifted pastor to many new readers. From S.P.C.K. also come three paper-back reprints: *Ara Coeli: an essay in mystical theology* by Arthur Chandler (6s.), first published in 1908; *God's Plan* by Frederic Hood (4s. 6d.), which was the Bishop of London's Lent Book for 1955; and *Sparrows of the Spirit* by Frank West (5s. 6d.), the story of the English country parson from Elizabethan times until to-day as seen in the lives of ten Nottinghamshire clergymen. Kierkegaard's *Christian Discourses,* together with "The Lilies of the Field and the Birds of the Air" and "Three Discourses at the Communion on Fridays", translated by Walter Lowrie, are now available as a paper-back (Oxford University Press, 11s. 6d.). A new and revised edition of A. M. Hunter's *Paul and his Predecessors* has been published by the S.C.M. Press (15s.): on the first edition see THEOLOGY, July 1941, pp. 50 f. We are glad to announce the appearance of *Augustinianum,* a new theological periodical under the direction of the Professors of the International Augustinian College (Via S. Uffizio, 25, Rome). It will be published three times a year, and will contain articles in Latin and in modern European languages on all the main branches of theology.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

GEOFFREY CHAPMAN: Dom Georges Lefebvre, *The Mystery of God's Love* (12s. 6d.); Frank Pakenham, *The Idea of Punishment* (10s. 6d.); Tim O'Neill, *And We, the People* (21s.).

DARTON, LONGMAN AND TODD: David Cox, *History and Myth* (18s.).

FAITH PRESS: Jack Cottam and Edgar Stephenson (Eds), *How to Teach the Christian Faith* (10s. 6d.); Elisabeth Montefiore, *Half Angels* (8s. 6d.).

LONGMANS: F. H. Brabant, *The Everlasting Reward* (15s.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: H. J. Schoeps, *Paul* (42s.).

MOWBRAYS: Jean Daniélou, *Christ and Us* (30s.).

JOHN MURRAY: Frithjof Schuon, *Stations of Wisdom* (21s.).

NATIONAL SOCIETY: R. G. K. Hickman, *The Relationship between Churches and Schools* (1s.); Kathleen Bliss, *Christians and the Crowther Report* (1s. 6d.).

NEWMAN PRESS (WESTMINSTER, MARYLAND): George S. Glanzman, S.J., and Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J., *An Introductory Bibliography for the Study of Scripture* ($1.50).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: Merrill C. Tenney (Ed.), *The Word for this Century* (28s.).

ST ANDREW PRESS: J. G. Riddell, *The Calling of God* (21s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Gerhard von Rad, *Genesis* (50s.); W. A. Beardslee, *Human Achievement and Divine Vocation in the Message of Paul* (10s. 6d.); Richard Taylor, *Christians in an Industrial Society* (8s. 6d.); E. H. Robertson, *Bible Weeks* (4s.); F. B. Welbourn, *East African Rebels* (21s.).

SHEED AND WARD: Cecily Hastings, *The Sacraments* (8s. 6d.).

SIDGWICK AND JACKSON: F. P. Chambers, *Perception, Understanding and Society* (25s.).

S.P.C.K.: Mabel C. Warburton, *To whom Paul Wrote* (4s. 6d.); Violet Welton, *Burning Coals of Fire* (5s.).

S.P.C.K. (for the CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY): M. H. Port, *Six Hundred New Churches* (50s.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON